

Office of the Director
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-7795
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

Planning Division
50 W. Gay St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)
Urban Design Manager
(614) 645-8404
djthomas@columbus.gov

DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

77 N. Front Street, STAT Room (Lower Level)

I. Attendance

11:20

Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Michael Brown; Kyle Katz; Tedd Hardesty; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk Jana Maniace

Absent: Danni Palmore (term expired)

City Staff: Daniel Thomas; Brandan Hayes; Kelly Scocco

II. Approval of the May 23, 2017 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Motion to approve (8-0)

III. Conceptual Review

Case #1 17-6-1C

12:30

Location: E. Oak Street

Applicant and Design Professional: Jay Boone / Moody Nolan

Property Owner: Mike Lisi / Motorist Insurance Group

Attorney Michael B. Coleman / Ice Miller

Request:

Conceptual Review for mixed use project, primarily residential. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion

Staff – site was featured in the 2010 Downtown Strategic Plan as a development location. Introductions. M Lisi gave Motorist's intentions and vision for the future. One of the four pillars was the community. Served on the board of Topiary Park for over 10 years. Important to keep community culture for this project. Fitting the project within the area comprised of schools libraries, museums, businesses, etc., is important. Doing justice to Topiary Park. Hired Moody Nolan and Robert Wyler to help. MN – Description of project. Follows the 2010 Strategic Plan as jumping off point. 0 lot line with soft edge along the park. Having a front door walkway. Building is 5 stories tall, walk up two story town houses, down a level garden units similar to Bishops Walk. Above, on levels 4 & 5 are apartment flats. Parking has to be worked into the plan on site, into the building. That goes on the less activated side of the building (Oak Street). It will be two levels, down a half level and up a half level. On the upper levels on top of the parking, will be terraces. It is really a 4½ story building in massing. Effort to break up the facade to brownstones as in London and New York. Picking up details from the neighborhood. Victorians and Italianates – all red brick. Stone lintels, bay windows. Varied roof lines. Some variance in brick color.

KK – Concern with tightness of Oak St. sidewalk as well as overall. RL – Nobody using this portion of Oak Street’s sidewalk. EG – we’re under 20 ft. on the promenade. RL – it is important that Library Park Drive continue to look like it is there. Could be pavers or gravel. Connection to the park will be awesome. We’ve been waiting for this development for years. EG – streetscape elements will help tie this together. SW – I like this, where it is going to come together is in the details – brickwork, windows, (we’ve seen project that unfortunately tried to save money on windows and the whole thing misses), stone work, trim, metal work. You put all of those things together with a landscape package, it could be very rich. I also like the scale. RL – agree. MB – points to the Carter development on Commons as lost opportunity (flat) versus Gay Street. Depth is important. Juliette balconies. A little modulation along Oak St. would be helpful.

KK – how will dumpsters be handled? Oak St. will be a challenge. ML – retail on Washington? A – will be at grade. Dealing with grade changes. Parking ratio 1 to 1.5. Right now we have 1 per bed. A – Other Motorist’s sites are not part of this, will come back. M Lisi – staged approach. The other sites are part of our long term vision. SW – retail facing across the street on Washington is a nice touch. RL – why traditional expression, Motorist’s is modern? M Lisi – question of community culture, in terms of responding to E. Town St. Oak St. and the other historic blocks. We did have a lot of conversation about that. RL – Parcel D has an historic house that should be considered. A – agreed. MB – try to consider work force housing as part of overall development on all parcels. A lot of higher end stuff currently on the market. Details are important. KK – it all looks great, there is a danger with value engineering. There is authenticity down the street that new product can be compared to. OB – this adds an awful lot to the entire area. Grant, Christo Ray, park

Results

No vote take, conceptual review only (Hardesty recusing)

IV. Certificate of Appropriateness for Prior Reviewed Cases

Case #2 17-6-2

44:00

Address: 404 East Broad Street

First Congregational Church

Applicant G. Thomas Worley

Design Professional: Mark Schieber & Charlie Weaver, Architectural Gardens

Property Owner : First Congregational Church, United Church of Christ of Columbus, Ohio

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for of a Garden that is currently surface parking.

This was conceptually reviewed last month..

Discussion

MS – a few changes have been made since last month, primarily at the Broad / Cleveland corner. This will create another place for another sculpture. Based upon request, three cross sections were done. Highest portion of the wall will be 10 ft. but the parking lot will be a number of feet above that level, thereby maintaining visibility. Explanation of spaces, movement, height differences, displays and materials. The grass grid will be a drivable surface. Continuity of green is important, including treatment of parking lot. The park will be handicapped accessible. ML – is the curb cut on Broad necessary. A – we’ve gone back and forth on that. Keeping it has something to do with accessibility and ease, more for the benefit of the church and for fire, emergency and funerals. SW – concern with overall maintenance. This also looks like a complicated thing when simplicity is sometimes the answer. A – from plan view it looks more complicated than it really is. Primary organizing element is the movement of one wall. Sculpture will interrupt this wall. Fountains will be continuously running. JM – suggests some form of treatment of fountain walls that will ensure

viability even if not on. A – glass would be sculptured / cut in that way. Difference would be sound. The “green walls” will be of living material. TH – questions about phasing. A – the parking lot might have weekends when it is closed off for art exhibits, etc. Aspects of the wall might be see through. RL – I think the question is what is funded and what is future. A – the park itself is funded along with initial wall. CW - The art will be later. Polished black granite or stainless steel or a sculpture of Washington Gladden. The water wall pieces are not necessarily part of phase one. The elevation changes are a major part of phase one. We want to be able to start building the foundation for the wall while we work out the rest of the detail. We are looking for approval to build the base for the wall as well as the plaza and curves. We will build the park and the landscaping. The water features and other art may not be done at this time. KK – move to approve. JM – will the water feature be built shortly after phase one, because if not there should be a backup plan.

Results

Motion to approve (7-1-0) (Loversidge recusing)

Case #3 17-6-3

1:05:00

Address: 274 E Long Street

Applicant and Design Professional : Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design

Property Owner: Eclipse Real Estate Group & Edwards Companies

Attorney: Connie Klema

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for 3-story Mixed Use Building – Ground Floor Parking and Retail, Upper 2 Floors - Apartments

The project was conceptually reviewed in April of this year.

Discussion

JB – has addressed concerns that were expressed at the April meeting. More glass on the west façade. Materials described and their locations clarified. The design responds to some code buildings requirements. Two different glazing systems are still being looked at. The stairs are open and can't be enclosed. The building site and the surface parking behind have separate ownership. RL – any streetscaping or landscaping to soften this? CK – the café may have an opportunity for sidewalk café space. RL – move for approval, KK – 2nd.

Results

Motion to approve (8-0)

Case #4 17-6-4

1:16:20

Address: 261 / 275 S. Front Street

Matan Project

Applicant & Property Owner: 261 Front, Ltd. (Lifestyle Communities)

Architect: Niles Bolton Associates (Atlanta)

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for additional floor (5 to 6) to previously approved project (Matan Project)

Discussion

SW – this project has already been approved, they are asking to add an additional floor. Andrew Wappner (Lifestyle) – there were comments on the fenestration for the ground floor garage openings. Glass has been incorporated into the lower two portions with mesh above. Ludlow will remain entirely screened. The elevations remain pretty much the same, just extruded up. MB – move to approve. ML – 2nd.

Results

Motion to approve (7-0-1) (Robert Loversidge recusing)

Case #5 17-6-5

1:19:08

Project: *Millennial Tower* **Location:** Southwest corner of Front and Rich Streets

Applicant and Design Professionals: Urban Design LLC, David Rectenwald, AIA

Property Owner: Bicentennial Plaza Holding Company, Ltd., et.al.

Attorney: Joseph A. Sugar

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for a major mixed-use retail / office / residential & parking building. Includes major LED graphic.CC3359.05(C)1)

The Millennial Tower was conceptually presented to the Commission in May of 2016. See the Results from that meeting.

Discussion

Status of review was discussed. At this time final is not a probable objective, and this will be more of an update and a way of determining if more advanced architectural drawings will be produced. The Planning staff has met with the applicant and expressed issues, primarily with the LED graphics. Bill Schottenstein – scope of the project means that we need to come in to review, get feedback and narrow down parameters. SW – eventually, we will have to have more detail.

A – project has grown from 25 to 27 stories and now includes a hotel. David Rectenwald – Seeking feedback for what sort of information will be sought by the Commission. Details of materials haven't changed much – exposed concrete floors, insulated glass system (blue tint on upper floors), clear glass at retail levels, silver window tracts, glass and metal rails for the balconies. Access changes off of Ludlow as opposed to Cherry. Top of the building will be a combination of metal framing and metal slats, hiding mechanicals.

LED and other graphics – screening for the parking decks. DR – the LED portion has been reduced about 50% with emphasis on the corners of Front and Rich and Front and Cherry. A – across from the Lazarus parking garage. The retail component will be 40,000 sf – a lot for downtown. There is a need (create visual energy) to pull people in, particularly pedestrians. A lot of positive changes in this area – Scioto Greenways and river, Commons, 225 Commons, 250 High, festivals. Increasing density to support retail. Lazarus Garage – 600 spaces that is full during the day but could expand its use at night. Impact of video signage over static signage, particularly at night, drawing people in from new developments. Creating a 20 hour downtown. We can control the hours and brightness of the LEDs. High Street as retail hasn't worked. We own the block that is cattycorner from this one, which is another opportunity if this location works.

KK – series of different ads or unified? A – probably a series. SW – the LED portion at the corners is 81 ft. in height. A - The entire Front St. width is about 185 ft. JM – particularly concerned about the north wrap and its impact on Lifestyle Communities (LC). RL – what about

the one at State and High, in terms of toning it down? That could be a good demonstration. We didn't anticipate that as being as bright as it is. A – we could do that. A lot of people like the brightness of that corner as a deterrence related to security. SW – how tall is the horizontal band on the Front St. side? A – 42 ft. SW – this is an enormous screen, far and away the largest. From my standpoint, I'm opposed to it. I would like to see you integrate this more into the retail so it looks more like a sign and less like a graphic. Out of scale and out of place.

KK – have you talked to LC and what is their reaction? A – 6, 7 months ago. No problem was expressed then. We will control the lighting. Activating the area is important. We shouldn't be looking in the rearview mirror (as in City Center) but forward. There has been a paradigmatic change in the way offices are built and how they function. Open space, exterior space. This will be unlike any other building in the city. Video signage is emerging as a part, particularly in major cities. This is appropriate area and context. This will be the epicenter of activity for the Riversouth area.

JM - rendering shows something interesting – blue and attractive graphic. But in reality, this could be anything. The static screening could also be problematic. We need to find a good solution for that too. Interesting lighting might be part of that, creative and dynamic. LED has to be smaller and not encroach on residences. Lower in intensity. Coming up with the solution might mean coming up with an integrated plan that would help compliment the building which is forward thinking and dramatic. A – the screening would be a scrim that would mimic to what we show on the rendering. Incorporate PSAs., things that are happening in the Riversouth area and elsewhere (i.e., Museum of Art). Could act as an information source. RL – the scrims would act as ad murals? A – yes, or PSAs. JM - do something more architectural or art. Problem with too much advertising. SW – we've had other parking garages where we have said you just can't put banners over. TH – I'd like to compliment the overall vision of the project. Floors 1-8 are a tough composition. The first two floors being retail would be awesome. I would love to see how you could integrate some great signage and graphics into this lower piece. The street level is most important. Have more fun, artistically with how you treat the garage. KK – our mutual objective is how to hide the parking. Our issues are content and lumens. During the day we're going to have something that adds interest and changes. Something that is additive to the area. Night could have elements that are "X" lumens that won't disturb the neighborhood but also add vitality. A – we'll come back with another iteration. Currently parking is exacerbated in the area and more is needed in this structure. Linking nodes of activities to make a good walkable downtown.

KK – I would like to see a solution that is disciplined in that it would guarantee an environment to those already living in the area and lock it in so it cannot be breached. OB – I think everyone would like to see this building built. Is the screen an important economic component to this building? A – expensive to build it and would help buttress the retail. .3 mile is regarded as easy walking distance in Columbus. About 30,000 work within that distance to the site and there are about 2,500 residential units. We have enough people, we just need to make it exciting. ML – I agree in need to make excitement, pointing to new building in LA. Don't know if this is there yet.

Bob Myers – 200, 250 Civic Center – it's great to have businesses like Motorist, Nationwide and Jeff Edwards who have made product combatable with the neighborhood. Has 3 or 4 issues. We currently have lease arraignment for 128 parking spaces on the existing surface parking site – that is a resolvable issue. 2.) huge electronic billboard – would jeopardize money already put into RiverSouth and new residences, carnival like lighting 365 days of the year. Concern about precedence as it relates to screens over parking garages such as the LeVeque. 3.) mixed use aspect is great, will be positive contribution. 4.) check Washington D.C. museums for unique way of handling parking screening. His company is working on a downtown proposal that will have

sculptured ornamental iron over parking here in downtown. Seinfeld clip of neighboring night light shown. A – wishes to have dialog. SW, RL – rest of the building is awesome. A large part of the building design is in the details. RL – I appreciate the fact that you have listened so far.

Results

No vote taken

V. Certificate of Appropriateness for New Cases

Case #6 17-6-6

2:09:30

Address: 44 North High Street

Applicant and Property Owner: 44 North High Corp.

Design Professional: TRIAD Architects

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for renovation. CC3359.05(C)1)

Discussion

DJT – work includes work on both High St. and more extensively, Pearl St. Zack Price, Triad Architects – window samples were no brought but will be fairly standard (clear) and dark bronze clad. The ground floor will be retail and upper floors apartments (4 residential units total). Building is very narrow – 20 ft. wide, 180 ft. deep. Meeting egress requirements is challenging, which can be handled by one stair (# of units and sprinklers). High St. façade is more of a restoration project. New storefront on 1st floor. Clear glazing transom replacing stucco. Back is parched masonry. It has been cut up and filled numerous times. SW – can't tell what you will be doing. New entrances will be provided. Retail space will have both front and back entrances. Initially, there will be pop-up places that might expand. Questions about details. SW – need for specificity (windows, materials, colors) no problem with what is shown. Suggestion for remanding to sub-committee (MB, ML or TH). KK – amended motion. RL – 2nd.

Results

Motion to approve pending subcommittee of Lusk and Hardesty reviewing and approving details. (8-0)

Case #7 17-6-7

2:22:00

Location: Franklin University, 201 S. Grant Ave., NW corner of Grant Ave. and Mound St.

Applicant and Design Professional: Mark Rubich, DaNite Sign Co.

Property Owner: Franklin University

Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for graphics including an LED message center on the northwest corner of Grant Avenue and Mound Street.

Discussion

Staff – ODOT's Mound St. off-ramp project took away a fair number of Franklin's surface parking and changed the major entry point into the university. In 2004 the Commission approved another LED sign at the corner of Grant and Main. This will be dismantled. The LED will display information pertaining to Franklin Univ. – classes, upcoming events, promotion of the university. Two locations are being considered – one in front of the brick wall and the other behind. TH – expressed concern that a monopole in front of the wall would not look appropriate. SW –

questioned the need for an LED screen at all. Carl Brown, Ex. Dir. Of Campus Services, Franklin Univ. – currently signage at corner of Grant and Main. That screen is largely obsolete. New traffic pattern making Grant and Mound main gateway. KK, JM – the current sign is more multi-user oriented, including pedestrian – this is almost exclusively auto oriented. The wall gets a lot of people walking on top of it, so putting it front of the wall might impede climbing. KK – questioned the marketing value of the LED, a better done sign, welcoming someone to the campus is needed. CB – at one time, not too long ago, Mound Street ended here at this wall with a parking lot behind. Now, it goes through. The old LED sign now seems to be in the wrong location. KK – sign with “welcome to Franklin” would both help the institution and the city. The video board above doesn’t resonate with the gravitas of the school. CB – we are trying to show that we are staying in front of the curve by being high tech. ML – I object to the monopoly. CB – there are other Franklin U. signs on campus that do similar thing. TH – I would love to see it come in front of wall, provided it isn’t a visibility issue. It is an important gateway. A base, some plant material, it might be a little too large. SW – I’d rather something that read like a monument sign. A – it is no bigger than the sign that is currently at the other corner. JM – couldn’t this just have a very attractive sign and let the LED remain at its current location? A – there will be 15,000 cars coming thru downtown on the new Mound vs. 5,000 on Main. SW – could you tweak this and come back? Try to be consistent from other campus signage. A – there are numerous universities and high schools that have LED displays. MB – move back across the street for a view.

Results

Tabled

VI. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness – Land Use Approval

Case #8 17-6-8LU

2:38:15

Address: 395 E. Mound Street

Applicant: The City Dog Daycare, LLC, Becky Hinga, Proprietor

Property Owner: Levine Ohio LLC

Attorney: David Hodge, Underhill & Hodge LLC

Design Professional: N/A, seeking Certificate of Appropriateness related to use only

Request:

Request for Special Use Approval for Use Dog Day Care

Animal day care or boarding requires Special Use approval from the Downtown Commission. Property owners within a 125 ft. radius have been notified as recommended by the Commission. part of the approval process.

Discussion

This Dog Daycare is currently at the NE corner of Washington and Main in downtown and is seeking a larger facility. The proposed new location is a former auto parts store. DH – there are criteria in your code and I believe we have met those. Neighbors – on the east side, a comparable business and on the west, a counseling facility (the land is owned by Franklin Univ.). They will come back for exterior improvements once land use approval is achieved.

Lee Burge, Eden Counseling Centers, is next door to the west and objected. Noise, smell and the nature of their clientele (drug –opiate - and mental health). Improvements have already been made to the area and should be maintained. It is also a gateway into downtown. There are also other businesses that the dog daycare would be a deterrence. Would have to consider moving location.

We liked the tranquility of this location. We've been here six months. We infrequently hear from the other dog daycare. This one would have a fenced in area directly pointing at us. TH – their outdoor area is in the back on Engler St. There is a child day care across the street, which is another concern. Franklin Univ. supported their tenant. Amethyst, a women's program, is also nearby and they actually walk around the street as part of treatment. National Church Residence (100 residential tenants)), south at the corner of Grant and Fulton, objected. It would be too much. 165 children at child care facility – also objected. We do hear the dogs at the other facility, especially in the evenings. Concern with safety.

Boarding overnight triggers need for Commission approval. Issues were also brought up by the adjacent dog day care about the size of the new facility and parking. BH – we didn't intentionally locate next to another facility but we have been looking for a long time. The Spring Street facility fell through due to interior environmental reasons. We will address all waste and run off. MB – motion to accept. ML – 2nd.

Results

Motion to approve land use (5-1) Maniace - no

VII. Business / Discussion

Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification (May 23, 2017)

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. 588 E Rich St. – CoA waiver for land use
2. 201 S High St. – Interior work only waiver
3. 320 E Long – surface parking and landscaping
4. 17 E Gay St. – Tiger + Lily Signage
5. 204 – 240 S Fifth St. – Holy Cross fencing
6. 34 W. Gay St. – Door
7. 136 E. Long St. – Parking landscape strip
8. 216 S High St. – Winan's sidewalk café (prior Commission approval)
9. 213 S. High St. – Trautman Bldg. fence wrap
10. 380 S Fifth St. – CoA waiver
11. 201 S. High St. – sign reface
12. ***S Elevation Huntington Park – Ad Mural***
13. ***N Elevation Huntington Park – Ad Mural***
14. ***15 W. Cherry St. – Apple Ad Mural***
15. 225 E Main – Uncle Sams – repaint sign
16. ***64 E. Broad St. – Columbus School for Girls – Ad Mural***
17. ***60 E. Long St. – Apple Ad Mural***
18. ***43 W. Long St. – Apple Ad Mural***
19. ***285 N. Front St. (Rear) – Apple Ad Mural***
20. ***35 W. Spring (Marriott) – Apple Ad Mural***

Next regular meeting will be on July 25, 2017, the fourth Tuesday of the month (four weeks away).

If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404.

2:50:10